



"John..Blair"@fakeaddress.net on 05/16/2001 10:27:28 AM

RECEIVED

To: SER, Bonnie Fogdall/YM/RWDOE
cc:

MAY 16 2001

Subject: SER Comment

Part of Records Package / Supplement / Correction

May 16, 2001 10:27:28

IP address: 152.163.201.204

---> Commentors Name: Mr. John Blair
---> Organization: Valley Watch, Inc
---> Position: president

---> The Commentors Address:
---> 800 Adams Ave.
---> Evansville, Indiana 47713

---> Email Information:
---> ecoserve1@aol.com
---> Add commentor to the mailing list : yes

---> Contact Information:
---> fax number : -
---> phone number : 812-4645663
---> organization : Valley Watch, Inc
---> position : president

---> Comment Text :
I sent the following letter to Governor Frank O'Bannon:

Dear Governor O'Bannon

The Department of Energy (DOE) has invited your comments on its consideration of a possible recommendation of Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for development as a permanent repository for high-level nuclear waste. I urge you to consider the many unanswered questions about the transportation scenario for shipping waste from reactor sites across the country to Nevada, and to raise these issues with the Secretary of Energy.

The Yucca Mountain Project, if approved, would launch an unprecedented nuclear transportation scheme, with 77,000 tons of high-level radioactive waste shipments passing through 43 states, within half a mile of 50 million Americans. Likely transportation routes through Indiana include I-80, I-64 and several rail routes. See: www.ymp.gov/timeline/eis/routes/routemaps.htm

As the DOE rushes to recommend Yucca Mountain for development as a nuclear repository, many concerns remain about the suitability of site itself. In addition, issues related to the large scale transportation of high-level waste through Indiana have not been addressed. Approximately 11,000 comments - more than half related to transportation concerns - were submitted on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mountain Project, but DOE has failed to respond.

1 Transporting high-level nuclear waste is inherently dangerous because it elevates the risk of radiological release and disperses this risk along transportation routes where our emergency response personnel may lack the training and equipment necessary to respond effectively to a radiological accident. Yet the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mountain Project deals inadequately with the transportation scenario. For example, the DOE has not specified which routes would be used for Yucca Mountain shipments or whether the waste would travel by train or by truck, and has not identified a clear process for making these decisions.

The canisters that would be used to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain have not been subjected to physical testing, and computer models rely on outdated testing parameters. Unanswered questions remain about the risk of sabotage and liability in the case of an accident. Even without an accident, nuclear waste transportation canisters routinely emit the equivalent of one chest x-ray per hour of harmful radiation.

Please ask the DOE to address these transportation issues before finalizing a site recommendation. I urge you to withhold support for the Yucca Mountain repository proposal until these concerns have been addressed and the feasibility of transporting nuclear waste to Nevada has been adequately assessed.

John Blair

800 Adams Avenue

Evansville, IN 47713

Ph.: 812-464-5663; Fax: 812-468-3375
